JOSHUA FORDYCE, A.K.A., BRITTANY FORDYCE, Plaintiff, v. HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al., Defendants.  Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United State Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. Plaintiff st hird request in less than two weeks. A comparison of this request with Plaintiff's previously filed one indicates that they provide the same reasons in support of the instant requise, that Plaintiff's personal property has been lost and that Plaintiff is experiencing emotions distress as a result. Compare ECF No. 14 (Plaintiff's second appointment of counsel request with ECF No. 16 (instant appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates a were filed so close to each other, Plaintiff's current request will be denied as duplicative. In		Case 1:25-cv-00106-GSA Document	t 17 Filed 02/10/25	Page 1 of 2	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  JOSHUA FORDYCE, A.K.A., BRITTANY FORDYCE, Plaintiff, v. HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al., Defendants.  Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United State Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.  Plaintiff shird request in less than two weeks. A comparison of this request with Plaintiff's previously filed one indicates that they provide the same reasons in support of the instant request, that Plaintiff's personal property has been lost and that Plaintiff is experiencing emotions distress as a result. Compare ECF No. 14 (Plaintiff's second appointment of counsel request). Given that the two requests for the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and that the two requests for the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates and the property of the appointmen	2 3				
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  JOSHUA FORDYCE, A.K.A., BRITTANY FORDYCE, Plaintiff, V. HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al., Defendants.  Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United Stat Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. Plaintiff has filed a request for the appointment of counsel. ECF No. 16. This is Plaintiff's third request in less than two weeks. A comparison of this request with Plaintiff's previously filed one indicates that they provide the same reasons in support of the instant reques, that Plaintiff's personal property has been lost and that Plaintiff is experiencing emotions distress as a result. Compare ECF No. 14 (Plaintiff's second appointment of counsel request with ECF No. 16 (instant appointment of counsel request).  Given that the two requests for the appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates a were filed so close to each other, Plaintiff's current request will be denied as duplicative. In	6				
JOSHUA FORDYCE, A.K.A., BRITTANY FORDYCE, Plaintiff, V. HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al., Defendants.  Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United Stat Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. Plaintiff st hird request in less than two weeks. A comparison of this request with Plaintiff's previously filed one indicates that they provide the same reasons in support of the instant req i.e., that Plaintiff's personal property has been lost and that Plaintiff is experiencing emotional distress as a result. Compare ECF No. 14 (Plaintiff's second appointment of counsel request with ECF No. 16 (instant appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates a were filed so close to each other, Plaintiff's current request will be denied as duplicative. In	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
JOSHUA FORDYCE, A.K.A., BRITTANY FORDYCE, Plaintiff, v. HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al., Defendants.  Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United State Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. Plaintiff st hird request in less than two weeks. A comparison of this request with Plaintiff's previously filed one indicates that they provide the same reasons in support of the instant requise, that Plaintiff's personal property has been lost and that Plaintiff is experiencing emotions distress as a result. Compare ECF No. 14 (Plaintiff's second appointment of counsel request with ECF No. 16 (instant appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates a were filed so close to each other, Plaintiff's current request will be denied as duplicative. In	9	FOR THE EASTERN	DISTRICT OF CALIF	ORNIA	
Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United Stat Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.  Plaintiff has filed a request for the appointment of counsel. ECF No. 16. This is Plaintiff's third request in less than two weeks. A comparison of this request with Plaintiff's previously filed one indicates that they provide the same reasons in support of the instant request, that Plaintiff's personal property has been lost and that Plaintiff is experiencing emotional distress as a result. Compare ECF No. 14 (Plaintiff's second appointment of counsel request) with ECF No. 16 (instant appointment of counsel are essentially duplicates a were filed so close to each other, Plaintiff's current request will be denied as duplicative. In	11 12 13 14 15	BRITTANY FORDYCE,  Plaintiff,  v.  HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al.,	ORDER DENYIN FOR THE APPOI	NG PLAINTIFF'S MOTION	
1	18   19   20   21   22   23   24   25   26   27				

	Case 1:25-cv-00106-GSA Document 17 Filed 02/10/25 Page 2 of 2			
1	doing, Plaintiff is informed that unless circumstances change significantly, similar			
2	appointment of counsel requests will be summarily denied.			
3	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of			
4	counsel (ECF No. 16) is DENIED as DUPLICATIVE.			
5				
6				
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
8	Dated: February 10, 2025 /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	2			